

State WAN Users Group

Meeting Minutes – October 15, 2003

Attendees: Jerry Smith (DHS), Greg Casey (DHS), Bruce Stewart (DFI), Roger Bishop (DEQ), Dallas DeFrancesco (Tax), Steve Fulling (ITS), Kevin VanAusdal (Tax), Tim Cornia (DPS), Jim Matsumura (DWS), David Lee (ITS), Russ Fairless (ITS), Randy Fisher (DOH), Nancy McConnell (ITS).

Copy: Richard Madsen (DOT), Michael Fellows (DOT), Darran Baggs (Land Trust), and, rest of IT Directors.

Next Meeting: Tuesday, December 9, 2003, 1:30pm – 3:30pm.

Location: DEQ Administration Building, 168 N. 1950 W. (just south of the Tax Building)
Room 201 (upstairs, just off the lobby atrium)

Agenda: Attached.

Agenda Items

1. Introductions.
 - See the above attendees list.
2. User group goals and future topics – discussion and brainstorm.
 - See attached brainstorming notes.
3. Topics for future meetings –prioritization.
 - The brainstormed items were grouped and prioritized for future discussion. The top priority topics are:
 - i. WAN architecture and planning
 - ii. Network security
 - iii. Policy Issues
 - iv. Monitoring and Support
4. Meeting logistics - frequency, dates, location, etc.
 - Meetings will be held on the 2nd Tuesday of each month, starting in December. Standard time: 1:30pm – 3:30pm.
 - We will not have future meetings in the SOB. The December meeting will be at DEQ.
5. Meeting facilitator(s) – agendas, minutes, action item tracking.
 - Nancy will facilitate meetings, including agendas, minutes and action item tracking.
6. State WAN Users Group web site.
 - Future item.

Action Items

Assigned to

Target

Schedule conference room in DEQ for next meeting.

Roger Bishop

Done

Plan for sharing the use of—or results of—ITS' MRTG (Multi Router Traffic Grapher) program that monitors traffic load on network links.

TBD

TBD

Brainstorming Notes

(Nancy's interpretation of folks' comments)

1. (Steve, Russ) What do we want out of the WAN? Originally we overbuilt the WAN, but now it is being consumed heavily, and we need plans for future growth. How do we fund bandwidth to support agencies' apps.
2. (Tim) UWIN (Utah Wireless Integrated Network) demands for wireless data products (e.g., 802.11 and mobile data) will impact the WAN and this group. Those of us who participate on the UWIN Technology Steering Committee should share with the WAN Users Group.
3. (Jim) DWS has provided ITS input regarding future apps they have coming on line. Yet they remain concerned about whether the current WAN infrastructure will support the demand.

Additionally, new and future technologies—such as IP Video and Voice over IP—will impact WAN infrastructure.

We need to cooperatively develop a vision and roadmap for the WAN infrastructure.

4. (Steve, David) There is a clear interest in WAN data traffic information. ITS can share the information they have, and, perhaps should increase their ability to measure for planning purposes.

Also have CSU and DSU data that show types of protocol traffic (e.g., http, telnet). This is available primarily at the geographic hubs, not on all links.
5. (Tim) Is it possible to identify specific traffic at a port—such as non-work related streaming video or music?
6. (Tim) We get proactive notifications from Qwest re. network degradation, problems, etc. We would like to get similar types of notifications from ITS Network Support. This would prevent lots of support calls coming into both agency and ITS Help Desks, and, provide a better level of service.
7. (Tim) WAN rate(s) would be a good future agenda topic.
8. (Tim) Network security would be a good future agenda topic. Important aspects of this topic include how security is/should be addressed across agencies, and, how ITS' security group should interface with agencies'. Additionally, it would be nice to discuss 802.11 Wireless LAN security for state buildings.
9. (Bruce, Steve) [...continuation of WAN rate item...]

It is important to identify a "philosophy" of what and how to charge for WAN. For example, should rates be based on bandwidth or other usage, and, should there be different rates for different service levels. As well, as agencies plan applications, how do the costs of increased WAN usage get built into rates.

10. (Kevin) Applauded movement of ITS and other agencies to work cooperatively in planning and managing the WAN. We need to be cognizant of and include users experiences of network performance as a key requirement of WAN planning. Network monitoring stats should not be the exclusive measure of sufficient network performance.
11. [...continuing rate item...] We pay \$400k per year to use the WAN. We have no idea of what we're using and what we're subsidizing.
12. Direction from the CIO is not clear as to the WAN and LANs – is ITS supposed to manage as a whole or not.
13. (Randy) Campus philosophy would be a good future agenda topic. Some examples are Capitol Hill and the Tax/DEQ/State Library campus. We could define the concept, operational model, and goals. We could identify opportunities. Consider the goals of off-loading central management and improving service.
14. (Jim) Another future agenda topic should be policy issues for WAN and Network security. Need to factor in agency peers and CIO direction.
15. (Randy) With the talk of the Legislature outsourcing WAN service, we might want to provide data that could be used in making a good decision.

Meeting Agenda – December 9, 2003

Attendees:

Next Meeting: January 13, 2004, 1:30pm – 3:30pm

Location:

Agenda Items

1. Review and approve last meeting minutes.
2. General Users Group questions, logistics, miscellaneous items.
3. WAN Architecture:
 - Handouts: ITS WAN Planning Group
 - Presentation – WAN architecture: ITS WAN Planning Group
 - Presentation – Process and tools used by WAN planners to manage WAN: ITS WAN Planning Group
 - Questions, Suggestions, Opportunities: All
4. If time...
 - Hand out proposed 802.11 security architecture document. Nancy
5. Topic(s) for next meeting.

Action Items

Assigned to

Target
